



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## V.—PHOENIX IN THE ILIAD.

If there is one point of agreement among disbelievers in the unity of the Iliad it is that Phoenix had no part in the original version of the Presbeia of book nine. The presence of Phoenix at the tent of Agamemnon, the persistent use of the dual, the part played by him rather than Cheiron as the instructor of Achilles, the fact that when Ajax nodded to Phoenix Odysseus arose and spoke, and also the abruptness with which he is introduced, all these unite to give absolute assurance to the critics, or in the words of Christ, Homer oder Homeriden, p. 75, Hier haben wir also festen Boden unter den Füßen und können mit Zuversicht für die verschiedenen Partien des 9. Gesanges zwei Verfasser annehmen. Leaf, Introduction to I, p. 371, in his edition of the Iliad, "All the evidence goes to show that he, Phoenix, is an intruder. The abruptness of his introduction and the dual number used of the envoys alike point to this". Similar comments abound in the writings of other Homeric critics.

A possible solution of this problem is to be found in observing the method by which Phoenix is introduced in subsequent books of the Iliad. A list of the leaders of the Myrmidons is given π 173 ff. Each of the five leaders Menesthius, Eudorus, Peisander, Phoenix, and Alkimedon is named with the addition of the name of his father and some detailed description or characteristic except Phoenix; he is simply introduced as, γέρων ἱππηλάτα Φοῖνιξ. This scant description can have but one explanation, namely, Phoenix has been previously described, so that the verses π 173 ff. presuppose just such a part as the one played by him in the Presbeia. This will hardly be questioned, and all critics who remove Phoenix from the Presbeia agree that these verses were added subsequent to his appearance in the ninth book. Christ prints the verses which refer to Phoenix in each of these books in the same small type, thus assigning them both to the same stratum.

The next appearance of this name, Phoenix, is π 555, where Phoenix does not act himself, but Athena assuming his form urged on Menelaus to attempt the rescue of the body of Patroclus;

*εἰσαμένη Φοίνικι δέμας καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν.*

The part here played by Athena is essential to the plot, so that Christ, who removed all traces of Phoenix from book nine, made this appearance of Athena in the guise of Phoenix part of his *Ur-Ilias*, printing this episode in the same large capitals in which, e. g., the quarrel-scene in A is printed.

When a god appears in the form of a definite, named person a detailed description is immediately added, unless the god assumes the form of a person who has already been described or has appeared in the action of the poem. Homer has no exceptions to this rule.

This rule is of such prime importance in the solution of the present problem that all the examples to which it applies will be given.

When the deceptive dream came to the tent of Agamemnon ;

B 20: *στῇ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς Νηληϊῶ νῦν οἰκῶς,  
Νέστορι, τὸν βα μάλιστα γερόντων τῷ Ἀγαμέμνων.*

A detailed description of Nestor has been given in the preceding book, hence sufficiently identified by the phrase *Νηληϊῶ νῦν*.

Iris came to warn the Trojans of the advance of the Greeks ;

B 791: *εἶσατο δὲ φθογγὴν νῦν Πριάμοιο Πολίτη,  
ὃς Τρώων σκοπὸς ἔζε, ποδωκείησι πεποιθώς,  
τύμβῳ ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ Αἰσινήταο γέροντος,  
δέγμενος ὅππότε ναῦφιν ἀφορμηθεῖεν Ἀχαιοί.*

Polites has not been previously mentioned, hence it is necessary to tell the hearers who he is and why Iris assumed his form.

Iris appeared to summon Helen to view the assembled Greeks ;

Γ 122: *εἰδομένη γαλόφ, Ἀντηνορίδαο δάμαρτι,  
τὴν Ἀντηνορίδης εἶχε κρείων Ἑλικάων,  
Λαοδίκην, Πριάμοιο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην.*

This is the first reference to Laodice, hence the detailed description.

Athena searched for Pandarus throughout the army of the Trojans ;

Δ 86: *ἡ δ' ἀνδρὶ ἐκέλη Τρώων κατεδύσεθ' ὁμίλον,  
Λαοδόκῳ Ἀντηνορίδῃ, κρατερῷ αἰχμητῇ.*

First mention of Laodocus, hence description and patronymic, but, as Antenor, his father, has already been named, additional details are unnecessary.

Mars came to arouse the faltering sons of Priam ;

Ε 462: εἰδόμενος Ἀκάμαντι θοῶ ἡγήτορι Θρηκῶν.

Two men with the name of Acamas have already been mentioned, one the son of Antenor, the other a leader of the Thracians, hence the necessity of the identifying phrase, ἡγήτορι Θρηκῶν.

Hera came to arouse the Greeks to whom she shouted ;

Ε 785: Στέντορι εἰσαμένη μεγάλητορι, χαλκεοφώνῳ,  
ὃς τόσον ἀνδρῆσασχ' ὅσον ἄλλοι πεντήκοντα.

First reference to Stentor, hence the detailed description.

Poseidon coming from the sea urged on the Argives ;

Ν 45: εἰσάμενος Κάλχαντι δέμας καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν.

Calchas has appeared in the earlier books, hence no description.

Poseidon chided the faltering Idomeneus ;

Ν 216: εἰσάμενος φθογγὴν Ἀνδραίμονος νῦν Θόαντι,  
ὃς πάσῃ Πλευρώνι καὶ αἰπεινῇ Καλυδῶνι  
Αἰτωλοῖσιν ἄνασσε.

Thoas has been previously mentioned, but as there are two others of this name referred to in the Iliad, this detailed description removes all possible ambiguity. This is a fine illustration of the rule that Homer never leaves in doubt the identity of the person whose form the god assumes, if that person's name is given.

Apollo appeared to Hector inspiring him to return to the battle.

Π 716: ἀνέρι εἰσάμενος αἰζήῳ τε κρατερῷ τε,  
Ἀσίῳ, ὃς μήτρῳς ἦν Ἑκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο,  
αὐτοκασίγνητος Ἑκάβης, νῖδος δὲ Δύμαντος,  
ὃς Φρυγίῃ ναίεσκε ῥοῆς ἐπὶ Σαγγαρίοιο.

This is the first appearance of this Asius, but another Asius, the son of Hyrtacus from Arisbe, has been mentioned, hence the long and detailed description is doubly necessary.

Apollo inspired Hector to rescue the arms of slain Euphorbus ;

Ρ 73: ἀνέρι εἰσάμενος, Κικόνων ἡγήτορι Μέντη.

First mention of Mentès, hence the necessary description.

Apollo came to Aeneas to urge him to join in the fighting ;

P 323: Αἰνείαν ὤτρυνε, δέμας Περίφαντι ἑοικώς,  
κῆρυκι Ἵππυτίδῃ, ὃς οἱ παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι  
κρύσσων γήρασκε, φίλα φρεσὶ μῆδεα εἰδώς.

First reference to this Periphas, hence detailed description.

P 555: εἰσαμένη Φοῖνικι δέμας καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν.

There is no description of any sort. This verse furnishes the motive for the present investigation, therefore the conclusion will be drawn later.

Apollo came to Hector to urge him to renew the struggle ;

P 583: Φαίνοπι Ἀσιάδῃ ἐναλίγκιος, ὃς οἱ ἀπάντων  
ξείνων φίλτατος ἔσκεν, Ἐβυδόθι οἰκία ναίων.

Two sons of Phaenops have been named, but he himself has not appeared in the action of the Iliad, hence the detailed description.

Apollo urged Aeneas to turn and face Achilles ;

Υ 81: νίει δὲ Πριάμοιο Λυκάονι εἰσατο φωνήν.

Lycaon has already been named as the brother of Paris, but as there is another Lycaon, the father of Pandarus, the identifying phrase, νίει δὲ Πριάμοιο, is necessary. The hearer is never left in doubt.

Apollo having rescued Agenor appeared to Achilles ;

Φ 600: αὐτῷ γὰρ ἐκάεργος Ἀγήνορι πάντα ἑοικώς.

Agenor has just played a prominent part, hence no description.

Athena came to deceive Hector and to betray him to Achilles ;

Χ 227: Δηφόβῳ εἰκνία δέμας καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν.

Deiphobus has repeatedly appeared in earlier books of the Iliad, hence sufficiently designated without added description.

There are no other examples in the Iliad of a god appearing in the form of a person whose name is given.

There are a few illustrations of this rule in the Odyssey ; Athena came to Ithaca in order to arouse and encourage Telemachus ;

α 105: εἰδομένη ξείνῳ, Ταφίων ἡγήτορι, Μέντη.

This particular Mentès has not been mentioned previously, hence detailed description. This description is much supplemented, vv. 180 ff.

The participle refers to Athena in β 268, 401, χ 206, ω 503, 548 ;

Μέντορι εἰδομένη ἡμὲν δέμας ἥδὲ καὶ αὐδὴν.

Mentor had taken part in the action of the poem before the first appearance of Athena in his guise, hence there is no description.

Athena moved among the Ithacans preparing for the departure of Telemachus.

β 383: Τηλεμάχῳ εἰκνία κατὰ πτόλιν ὤχετο πάντη.

Telemachus had already been prominent in this and the preceding book of the Odyssey, hence there is no description.

Athena made a divine image which she sent to hearten Penelope ;

δ 796: εἰδῶλον ποίησε, δέμας δ' ἤκτο γυναικί,  
'Ιφθίμη, κόρυη μεγάλῃτορος Ἰκαρίοιο.

First reference to Iphthime, hence detailed description is necessary.

A god often appears in the guise of some unnamed person or character, such as a messenger, a young man, an old man, a maiden, or a woman, but such appearances necessarily do not individualize, hence do not belong to the subject now discussed.

All the passages have been quoted in which a god assumes the form of a person whose name is given. In every case the person whose form or voice has been assumed is well-known, or a detailed description is added. The hearer is never left in doubt for one moment about the identity of the person whose characteristics the god has taken.

To which class does the verse in question belong? To quote the verse, P 555: εἰσαμένη Φοῖνικι δέμας καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν, is to answer the question ; since the absence of any sort of description shows that Phoenix is a person already well-known to the hearers of the previous books of the Iliad. Christ was quite right in observing that P 555 is essential to the action of the Iliad and to his Ur-Ilias, and in assigning it to his earliest stratum, but he failed to observe that this scene is impossible unless Phoenix has had a part in the earlier scenes of the Iliad. This verse cannot remain without assuming a Phoenix in the Presbeia and also a Presbeia in the Ur-Ilias. This fact seems to me to demolish the structure which Christ reared with such labor and such assurance.

The next appearance of Phoenix is in T 310. Achilles after

the reconciliation with Agamemnon dismissed the others, while those of more advanced years remained to comfort him ;

Τ 310: δοιῶ δ' Ἀτρεΐδα μενέτην καὶ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,  
Νέστωρ Ἰδομενεύς τε γέρων θ' ἱππηλάτα Φοῖνιξ,

How could Christ have explained the presence of Phoenix in this small group of companions and friends, if this were his first appearance in person in the action of the Iliad? The manner in which he is here named assumes that he is a familiar figure and that he must have had a part in the story of some earlier book. However Christ assigns these verses to an older stratum than any in which Phoenix has himself appeared. The only possible excuse for the abrupt mention of Phoenix in this group of intimate companions is to be found in the fact that previously he has appeared as a friend and associate of Achilles. The needed explanation is given in the Presbeia.

After the quarrel is over and well-nigh forgotten, and the battles of the Iliad are ended the poet once more brings the heroes of his poem before his audience in the games in honor of Patroclus. Phoenix himself is too old to take part and, since, unlike Nestor, he has no son to admonish, it might have seemed impossible for the poet to present him at this final gathering of the Greeks. However in the chariot-race it was necessary that some responsible person should be placed at the outer end of the course to watch that the drivers ran the full length and did not turn back until they had rounded the outmost point; this must be some one in the confidence of Achilles, and one not biased by the fact that a kinsman or close companion was a participant. Phoenix satisfied every condition, so he too appears at the games to make his farewell; although his part is a small one, it is essential.

Ψ 358: σήμενε δὲ τέρματ' Ἀχιλλεὺς  
τηλόθεν ἐν λείῳ πεδίῳ· παρὰ δὲ σκοπὸν εἰσεν  
ἀντίθεον Φοῖνικα, ὅπανα πατρὸς ἐοῖο  
ὥς μεμνέωτο δρόμους καὶ ἀληθείην ἀποείποι.

The task assigned to Phoenix must have been assigned to some one, since the tricks actually employed in the course of the race show that the outer goal would not have been rounded unless some one had been placed there for this very purpose, namely, to prevent the shortening of the course. Critics who object to this office being given to Phoenix must be prepared

to substitute another in his place, for this was an office that could not have been neglected. The fact that each driver went the full course shows that some one was at the far goal. Naturally Phoenix was not called upon to decide the subsequent dispute, since the fact of rounding the goal was not the subject of contention.

These four passages subsequent to book nine in which reference is made to Phoenix are consistent and imply that he is a familiar figure in the action of the poem, each assumes the *Presbeia* with Phoenix a member or companion thereof. If there is any objection to the retention of Phoenix in the *Iliad* it must be founded on the basis of the earlier book, and if rejected from that book he must be rejected from all.

The first difficulty to present itself in the story of Phoenix is that his initial appearance is at the tent of Agamemnon, when he would naturally be in the company of Achilles. Phoenix was a supernumerary in the Greek army, Peleus had no especial need of him in Phthia, he had no family-ties to keep him at home, so came along with the Myrmidons to the war. However necessary the old man may have thought he was to his foster-son, the latter never made any reference to reciprocal sentiments, but in his reply to the pleadings of Odysseus he says that he himself intends to return home to Phthia, but as for Phoenix he can remain or go along with him just as he prefers. This shows that the bonds uniting them were so loose that Phoenix could at will absent himself from Achilles, and that he, Achilles, felt himself under no especial obligations either to watch over him at Troy or to bring him safely back to Greece.

Doubtless his years gave Phoenix the freedom of the Greek camp so that he could remain where he chose.

All the context and the fact that he did not return to the place of starting show that Phoenix was no essential member of the embassy. He was with the army solely because he had been a nurse and boyhood companion of Achilles, so nothing could be more natural than his being asked to lead the way for Odysseus and Ajax to Achilles' quarters. It is worth noting that it was not one of the younger leaders, but Nestor, who suggested that Phoenix conduct the others, himself an old man, he felt the advantage the ambassadors might have in the coöperation of a man of advanced years.

When they are started, even though the party consists of five



members, Phoenix, Odysseus, Ajax, Odius, and Eurybates, its movements and numbers are frequently described by the dual, e. g., v. 182: τὼ δὲ βάτην. This dual involves no inconsistency, it is not used for the plural, but simply records the patent fact that the real embassy had but two members, Phoenix simply conducted them to Achilles, and having fulfilled that task, was under no obligation to return with the others. This use of the dual to refer to the two members of a group that are of especial importance is of the same type as the singular in Xen. Anab. I, 10, 1: βασιλεὺς δὲ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ διώκων εἰσπύπτει εἰς τὸ Κύρειον στρατόπεδον. Although many participate in the action denoted by the participle and the verb, yet because of the importance of the king the singular is used.

However it is in regard to verse 223 ;

νεῦσ' Αἴας Φοῖνικι. νόησε δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,

that critics speak with the greatest confidence ; and it was the absurdity of the statement that when Ajax nodded to Phoenix, Odysseus arose and spoke, that made Christ certain of "festen Boden unter den Füßen". When the embassy was preparing to depart Nestor knew and everyone must have felt that the success of the undertaking depended on Odysseus, hence it is especially to him that Nestor directs his advice ; 180: δειδῖλλον ἐς ἕκαστον, Ὀδυσσῇ δὲ μάλιστα. Now when the crisis has come Ajax with his wonted sagacity starts to upset all their plans by nodding to Phoenix, as if that ineffectual and loquacious individual were the proper person to present the cause of the despairing Greeks : Odysseus perceives the situation in an instant, and that is just like him, does not give Phoenix a chance to begin, but opens the case himself.

It was exactly like blundering tactless Ajax to do that sort of a thing. He never could see the point in Achilles' anger, so when he speaks makes the telling argument, "You are angry over just one girl and here we offer you seven". Homer never gives Ajax the honor of an aristeia, and in spite of his great strength he was not victor in a single game, although he competed in three. In the wrestling match with Odysseus Ajax whispered to make it a sham, ἥ μ' ἀνάειρ' ἥ ἐγὼ σέ ; then stupidly allows Odysseus to throw him, but it is to be noted that the wily Odysseus did not reciprocate. It is, no doubt, a thrust at this same stupidity that makes Ajax, though he had no chariot to

help him, labor and sweat under his bronze-covered shield of seven hides. Hector struck it when he called to him N 824: *Αἶαν ἀμαρτοεπές, βουγάιε*. Nothing could be more consistent than the Homeric picture of Ajax as a man of immense brute strength, but with no tact and shrewdness. Ajax was just the sort of a man to nod to Phoenix when Odysseus was prepared and present. If there is another phrase in the Iliad which sums up the traits of character with such a masterly stroke as the words "Ajax nodded to Phoenix", I have not seen it.

In A 831 Eurypylus begs Patroclus to treat him with some of the skill in healing which has been taught him by Achilles whom Cheiron one of the Centaurs has taught. To which Leaf notes, "The scholia properly remarked that the legend of the education of Achilles by Cheiron is entirely inconsistent with the tale of Phoenix in I". The relevant passage begins with verse 485, where Leaf has a similar note. "This is inconsistent with the legend of Achilles' education by Cheiron, and is another indication that the Phoenix-episode is a composition independent of the accepted legends of the Iliad". The verses which apparently contradict the Cheiron legend are;

I 485: *καί τε τοσοῦτον ἔθηκα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,  
ἐκ θυμοῦ φιλέων, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐθέλεσκες ἄμ' ἄλλω  
οὔτ' ἐς δαῖτ' ἵεναι οὔτ' ἐν μεγάροισι πᾶσασθαι,  
πρίν γ' ὅτε δῆ σ' ἐπ' ἐμοῖσιν ἐγὼ γούνεσσι καθίσσας  
δῶον ἄσαιμι προταμῶν καὶ οἶνον ἐπισχόν.  
πολλάκι μοι κατέδενσας ἐπὶ στήθεσσι χιτῶνα  
οἶνον ἀποβλύζων ἐν νηπιέῃ ἀλεγεινῇ.*

The duties and trials of Phoenix closely resemble those of the nurse of Orestes as told by herself in the Choephoroi. No doubt these things seemed to him sufficient to make him a man of great importance in the eyes of Achilles, as they surely do in the eyes of the critics. I am unable to follow the argument that because Achilles had been an infant "mewing and puking" in old Phoenix's arms he could not therefore have been instructed in medicine by Cheiron or by anyone else. To such a pass has higher criticism brought men of the greatest learning and the soundest judgment! Düntzer objected to the use of *ἐς δαῖτα* in the third verse quoted above, since he was "offended at the idea of an infant in arms going to a banquet", quoted approvingly by Leaf. Telemachus sends the beggar-Odysseus to the city, ρ 10: *ῥῥ' ἂν ἐκείθι δαῖτα πτωχεύῃ* which means that he may there beg his

food, the idea of beg a "banquet" would be absurd. This is but one of the many places where the word must refer to the simplest sort of food. The verse in question then simply means, "Thou wouldst not go to thy meals with another, nor take food in thy room, until I put thee on my knees".

The events and speeches of the Presbeia and all references to Phoenix in subsequent books agree in showing that he was an original though unimportant participant in the action of the Iliad.

The presence of Nestor made it impossible for another old man of decidedly inferior rank and ability to play more than a humble part in the economy of the poem, while on the other side the prominence of Patroclus excluded him from achieving eminence as the friend and companion of Achilles.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

Professor Rothe, *Ilias als Dichtung* 227 ff., has discussed the arguments previously advanced in regard to Phoenix and has so fully covered the literature of this subject, that I have limited my references to the writings of von Christ and Doctor Leaf, two of the foremost defenders of the Kernel or Ur-Ilias theory of the composition of the Iliad.